LIBRARY
SUPREME COURT, U. S.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20543

Supreme Court, U. S.
FILED
DEC 27 1976
MICHAEL RODAK, JR., CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1976

No. 76-419

VERMONT YANKEE NUCLEAR POWER CORPORATION,
Petitioner,
v.

NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL, INC., NEW ENGLAND COALITION ON NUCLEAR POLLUTION AND CONSOLIDATED NATIONAL INTERVENORS, INC.,
Respondents.

BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO A PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

RICHARD E. AYRES
Attorney for Respondents

Mailing Address:
NATURAL RESOURCES
DEFENSE COUNCIL, INC.
917 Fifteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

RICHARD COTTON
Attorney for Respondents

Mailing Address:
NATURAL RESOURCES
DEFENSE COUNCIL, INC.
2345 Yale Street
Palo Alto, California 94306

WILSON - EPES PRINTING CO., INC. - RE 7-6002 - WASHINGTON, D. C. 20001

BLEED THROUGH POOR COPY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED	ii
OPINION BELOW	1
JURISDICTION	1
QUESTIONS PRESENTED	2
STATUTES AND REGULATIONS INVOLVED	2
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	2
REASONS FOR NOT GRANTING THE WRIT	2
I. The Procedural Challenges Raised By Petitioner Rest On A Misstatement Of The Holding Below and Ignore The Substantive Basis For The Court Of Appeals Ruling	3
II. The Decision Below Does Not Address The Timing Of The Preparation Of An Impact Statement And Is Completely Consistent With The Decision In *Kleppe* v. *Sierra Club*	5
III. The Court Of Appeals Properly Reviewed The Administrative Record And Found It Adequate	8
CONCLUSION	12

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

Cases

Aberdeen & Rockfish Railroad Co. v. *SCRAP*, 422 U.S. 289 (1975) 6
Calvert Cliffs Coordinating Committee v. *AEC*, 449 F.2d 1109, 1114 (D.C. Cir. 1972) 6
Citizens to Preserve Overton Park v. *Volpe*, 401 U.S. 402, 215 (1971) 8
Indian Lookout Alliance v. *Volpe*, 484 F.2d 11 (8th Cir. 1973) 6
Kleppe v. *Sierra Club*, —— U.S. ——, 44 U.S.L.W. 5104 (June 28, 1976) 5, 6
Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc. v. *Morton*, 458 F.2d 827 (D.C. Cir. 1973) 7
NLRB v. *Brown*, 380 U.S. 278, 291-92 (1965) 9
Scientists' Institute for Public Information, Inc. v. *AEC*, 481 F.2d 1089 (D.C. Cir. 1973) 6

Statutes

National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, 42 U.S.C. § 4331 *et seq.* ..... *passim*
Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. § 706 2

BLEED THROUGH POOR COPY

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1976

No. 76-419

VERMONT YANKEE NUCLEAR POWER CORPORATION,
Petitioner,

v.

NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL, INC., ET AL.,
Respondents.

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit

---

BRIEF FOR RESPONDENTS IN OPPOSITION

OPINION BELOW

The opinion of the Court of Appeals (Appendix to the Petition (App.) A-1) is not yet reported.

JURISDICTION

The jurisdictional requisites are adequately set forth in the Petition.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Does an inadequate record require that a case be remanded to an agency for further proceedings?

2. Does the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 require federal agencies to consider all reasonably possible environmental impacts, or only a portion of those impacts?

3. May an agency insulate an inadequate record from judicial review by asserting it is exercising its technical expertise?

STATUTES AND REGULATIONS INVOLVED

The pertinent provision of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, 42 U.S.C. § 4332, and Section 553 of the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. § 553, are set forth at App. A-258-260 and A-159-160. Section 10(e) of the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. § 706, is set forth in Respondents' Appendix (Resp. App.) A-10.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Respondents' statement of the case appears in Respondents' Brief in Opposition filed in No. 76-548.

REASONS FOR NOT GRANTING THE WRIT

This petition and the petition filed in No. 76-548 both refuse to acknowledge the salient fact about the present case: the record compiled by the Atomic Energy Commission (now the Nuclear Regulatory Commission) (the "Commission") in both the generic rulemaking proceeding and in the individual licensing proceeding involved in the present case is flagrantly inadequate. One member

BLEED THROUGH POOR COPY

of the hearing board that presided at the rulemaking found that the staff had totally failed to document its assumptions in the court proceedings in contrast to its usual practice. App. A-29-30 n. 48. The majority opinion in the court below summarized the record on the grave potential impacts of reprocessing and disposal of radioactive wastes as consisting of "extremely vague assurances by agency personnel that problems yet unsolved will be solved." App. A-38. And Judge Tamm's concurring opinion condemned the inadequacy of the record, stressing the need to avoid "reckless decisions to mortgage the future for the present, glibly assuring critics that technological advancement can be counted upon to save us from the consequences of our decision." App. A-51.

Indeed neither petition seriously disputes the Commission's failure in either the individual licensing proceeding or the legislative rulemaking to address seriously the environmental hazards posed by the creation of large amounts of radioactive wastes.

Respondents believe, therefore, that even if this Court reviewed the issues raised by petitioners, the case will inevitably have to be remanded to the Commission for further proceedings. Thus little point would be served by review by this Court at the present time. In any event, the issues raised by petitioners were correctly decided by the Court of Appeals and merely represent the application of established principles to the facts of the present case. This case, in sum, presents no occasion for review by this Court.

I. The Procedural Challenges Raised By Petitioner Rest On A Misstatement Of The Holding Below And Ignore The Substantive Basis For The Court Of Appeals Ruling.

Petitioner's major argument focuses on the Court of Appeals' discussion of alternative rulemaking procedures

and attempts to fashion this discussion into the court's holding. Thus Vermont Yankee's petition asserts:

> The Court of Appeals . . . held that the rulemaking proceeding which the Commission had on the subject was procedurally—not substantively—defective . . . .

Pet. 12.

> Nevertheless, the court held that the Commission's rulemaking proceeding insufficiently "ventilated" the issues. There is, however, no basis in law for the imposition of special procedures to achieve such a goal.

Pet. 13.

Respondents believe that this characterization of the Court of Appeals' decision misstates the basis for the holding of the court below. Contrary to petitioner's assertion, the Court of Appeals clearly held that the substantive record compiled by the Commission was woefully inadequate to sustain the rule finally adopted by the Commission. App. A-23 to A-38. And even more plainly, the court did not hold that special procedures had to be adopted for their own sake. Rather the court tied its discussion of procedure directly to the Commission's failure to generate an adequate record:

> We do not presume to intrude on the agency's province by dictating to it which, if any, of these devices it must adopt to flesh out the record. . . . Whatever techniques the Commission adopts, before it promulgates a rule limiting further consideration of waste disposal and reprocessing issues, it must in one way or another generate a record in which the factual issues are fully developed.

App. A-40 to A-41.

BLEED THROUGH POOR COPY

Respondents' full discussion of petitioner's procedural challenges to the holding below appears in Respondents' Brief in Opposition in No. 76-548.[1]

II. The Decision Below Does Not Address The Timing Of The Preparation Of An Impact Statement And Is Completely Consistent With The Decision In *Kleppe* v. *Sierra Club*.

The petitioner's contention that the Court of Appeals' holding conflicts with *Kleppe* v. *Sierra Club*, —— U.S. ——, 42 U.S.L.W. 5104 (June 28, 1976) is unsupportable. It is not altogether clear precisely how petitioner claims the decision below is inconsistent with *Kleppe*. The Petition faults the Court of Appeals' decision because the Court of Appeals "held that the Commission may not confine itself to the environmental effects of the proposal before it (i.e., the licensing of a single generating plant) but must consider the environmental effects of the entire fuel cycle." Pet. 16. But the basic issue in *Kleppe* was whether the Interior Department had a plan or proposal for regional development of the Northern Great Plains Region that required the preparation of an environmental impact statement on such a regional plan. Based on the record in that case, this Court held that the Interior Department was not considering such a plan or proposal. 44 U.S.L.W., at 5107. Therefore, in

[1] In its Supplemental Brief, petitioner emphasizes that the Court of Appeals amended its opinion to remove reference to "the only specific procedural criticism which it made of the agency record." Petitioner's Supp. Brief, at 4. Petitioners choose to ignore, of course, that the correction was essentially trivial. The record reflects that the Hearing Board asked the Commission's only witness on waste disposal a few *pro forma* questions, Resp. App. A-1, instead of no questions, as the court's opinion originally stated. But the fault the court found with Commission's proceedings was that the record produced was inadequate, not that the Commission committed one particular procedural sin. The court's view of the record could not be affected by the presence or absence of the few questions involved in the correction of the court's opinion.

Kleppe, this Court held there was no proposed major federal action which required the preparation of an environmental impact statement pursuant to NEPA. Moreover, the Court noted that it was inappropriate for a court to intrude "on the germination process of a potential proposal" and to set the time when an EIS should be prepared. 44 U.S.L.W., at 5108.

In this case there is no question that the Commission proposed to issue an operating license for the Vermont Yankee nuclear power reactor. There is no quarrel about *what* proposed action the EIS should analyze or even *when* an impact statement should be prepared. Accordingly, *Kleppe* is not related to the issues raised by this case.

Petitioner's alleged conflict with *Kleppe* is in fact simply an argument that the Court of Appeals required the Commission to assess environmental effects which the petitioner believes should not be considered. The court below applied the unexceptionable principle that an agency's Environmental Impact Statement must weigh the direct, nonspeculative environmental consequences of a specific proposed action before the agency may proceed. *Aberdeen & Rockfish R. Co.* v. *SCRAP*, 422 U.S. 289 (1975); *Calvert Cliffs Coordinating Committee* v. *AEC*, 449 F.2d 1109, 1114 (D.C. Cir. 1972); *Indian Lookout Alliance* v. *Volpe*, 484 F.2d 11 (8th Cir. 1973). That some of the environmental consequences of a proposed action may be separated by space or time from the proposed action is irrelevant to a determination of the scope of the impacts to be considered in the statement. As *Kleppe* itself noted, NEPA requires a "detailed" impact statement that evaluates the full environmental consequences of proposed actions. 44 U.S.L.W., at 5109. *See also Scientists' Institute for Public Information, Inc.* v. *AEC*, 481 F.2d 1079 (D.C. Cir. 1973); *Natural Resources*

BLEED THROUGH POOR COPY

Defense Council, Inc. v. *Morton*, 458 F.2d 827 (D.C. Cir. 1973).

The issue is simply one of completeness. An impact statement must analyze all potential environmental impacts of a proposed development, not just a portion of these impacts. During its operation, a nuclear reactor will inevitably generate radioactive wastes. These wastes must be managed and disposed of, and these activities will cause significant environmental impacts. In fact, these wastes represent possibly the major environmental problem posed by nuclear power. The Court of Appeals held that an environmental impact statement on a proposal to issue an operating license to a nuclear power reactor must consider these potentially severe impacts before operation of the reactor is approved.[2] To do otherwise requires court and agency to blind themselves to these potentially major impacts. Respondents believe the decision of the court below was plainly correct. Moreover, the issue involved hardly deserves review in this Court. The environmental effects that should be included

---

[2] The Court of Appeals put the issue well:

> The real question posed by the Board's opinion is whether the environmental effects of the wastes produced by a nuclear reactor may be ignored in deciding whether to build it because they will later be considered when a plant is proposed to deal with them. To answer this question any way but in the negative would be to misconstrue the fundamental purpose of NEPA. Once a series of reactors is operating, it is too late to consider whether the wastes they generate should have been produced, no matter how costly and impractical reprocessing and waste disposal turn out to be; all that remain are engineering details to make the best of the situation which has been created. NEPA's purpose was to break the cycle of such incremental decision-making . . . . Decisions to license nuclear reactors which generate large amounts of toxic wastes requiring special isolation from the environment for several centuries are a paradigm of "irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources" which must receive "detailed" analysis under § 102(2)(C)(v) of NEPA, 42 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(C)(v). App. A-11 to A-12.

in an environmental impact statement are highly dependent upon the facts and circumstances of the particular project in question. This analysis hardly involves a legal question that merits the attention of this Court.

Petitioner also argues that "the unique history of congressional regulation and oversight in the nuclear field," Pet. 16-17, should exempt from analysis under NEPA the potential environmental impacts of radioactive wastes. Respondents believe this contention is frivolous. NEPA was enacted to require federal agencies to take environmental effects into consideration in their decisionmaking as well as to ensure that the Congress and the President receive information on potential environmental impacts. If the passage of a statute sanctioning particular activities by the federal government was itself read as an indication that Congress intended no review of environmental consequences of these activities, NEPA would apply to nothing. NEPA requires all agencies to address environmental concerns in their decisionmaking. The Court of Appeals has simply applied that directive in the present case to the Commission's licensing of nuclear reactors. There is nothing remarkable about this holding, and it is not a question deserving the attention of this Court.

III. The Court Of Appeals Properly Reviewed The Administrative Record And Found It Adequate.

Petitioner argues that the court below improperly disregarded the technical judgment of the Agency. But technical judgment must rest on an adequate record. This Court has recognized that review of agency action under the arbitrary and capricious standard of Section 10(e) of the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. § 706, requires an "inquiry into the facts [which] is to be searching and careful." *Citizens to Preserve Overton Park* v. *Volpe*, 401 U.S. 402, 415 (1971). Moreover,

BLEED THROUGH POOR COPY

Overton Park made clear that the presumption of regularity and an agency's expertise are "not to shield [its] action from a thorough, probing, in-depth review" to determine "whether the decision was based on a consideration of the relevant factors." *Id.*, at 416. Moreover, this Court has also repeatedly pointed out that

> [D]ue deference is to be rendered to agency determinations of fact, *so long as* there is substantial evidence to be found in the record as a whole.

NLRB v. *Brown*, 380 U.S. 278, 291-92 (1965) (emphasis added).

But such deference plainly is irrelevant if under either the substantial evidence test or the arbitrary and capricious standard, the record is inadequate to sustain the agency's action. In short, agency action cannot be shielded from judicial review simply by an incantation of a talismanic phrase. If no evidence exists in the record to support a particular conclusion, the agency's action cannot stand no matter how expert the decision-maker.

Petitioner's argument, therefore, is aimed at the wrong target, since the Court of Appeals set out at such great length the inadequacies the court saw in the record. The Court of Appeals established in painstaking detail the Commission's statements for which no support existed in the record. In addition, the court canvassed the statements of the only staff witness to discuss the issue of waste disposal, carefully identifying assertion after assertion that either had no support in the record or raised questions without answering them. *See* App. A-23 to A-38.

The court noted that one member of the Commission hearing board had acknowledged that the record in the

present proceeding was woefully deficient in contrast to other Commission proceedings and normal Commission practice:

> [o]ne of the, I think, outstanding practices of the Staff has been in the past, at least as far as I can tell, to meticulously document the assumptions that are made in the discussions. I find that that has not been done here. . . .

App. A-29-30 n. 48.

Petitioner appears to contend that an agency may insulate an inadequate factual record from judicial review by a claim that the agency is exercising "technical judgment." This argument might suggest that federal agencies no longer need adequate records on which to base their decisions. The real basis for petitioner's argument, however, appears at page 19 of its petition when petitioner implies, but certainly attempts no demonstration, that the Court of Appeals' conclusion about the adequacy of the record was incorrect.

Petitioner's reluctance to attack the Court of Appeals' conclusion that the Commission's record was inadequate is understandable on two grounds. First, that conclusion is in fact unassailable. Second, the question whether the record before the Commission was adequate is hardly an issue of sufficient import to justify review in this Court.

The Commission devoted one and a half days to the hearings investigating the potential environmental impact of waste disposal—possibly the major environmental hazard posed by nuclear power. The record it made consisted of unsupported and vague assurances by one witness, despite major uncertainties and problems reflected in the record. And as petitioner points out, Pet. 19, the Court of Appeals noted in its opinion that subsequent events have already made a mockery of many assertions in the testimony of one witness that is in the record.

BLEED THROUGH POOR COPY

App. A-27 n. 46, A-33, n. 51, 52. There is simply no question here of the exercise of "technical judgment." What the Court of Appeals held was that no factual record existed on which to base technical judgment, and the Court of Appeals' extended analysis, App. A-23 to A-38, demonstrates the correctness of that conclusion.

Therefore, what the petitioner is actually asking this Court to do is to review the record of the Commission's proceeding and determine whether it was in fact adequate. Respondents respectfully submit that review of the Court of Appeals' decision on this question—particularly when the analysis of the lower court is so plainly correct—is simply not an issue deserving the attention of this Court.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set out above and in Respondent's Brief in Opposition in No. 76-548, the Petition for a Writ of Certiorari filed in this case should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

RICHARD E. AYRES

Mailing Address:
NATURAL RESOURCES
DEFENSE COUNCIL, INC.
917 Fifteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

RICHARD COTTON

Mailing Address:
NATURAL RESOURCES
DEFENSE COUNCIL, INC.
2345 Yale Street
Palo Alto, California 94306

Attorneys for Respondents
Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.
New England Coalition on Nuclear Pollution, Inc.
Consolidated National Intervenors, Inc.

BLEED THROUGH POOR COPY

LIBRARY
SUPREME COURT, U. S.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20543
DEC 27 1976
MICHAEL RODAK, JR., CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1976

Nos. 76-419 & 76-548

VERMONT YANKEE NUCLEAR POWER CORPORATION,
Petitioner
v.
NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL, INC., NEW ENGLAND COALITION ON NUCLEAR POLLUTION, and CONSOLIDATED NATIONAL INTERVENORS, INC.,
Respondents

BALTIMORE GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY, et al.,
Petitioners
v.
NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL, INC. and CONSOLIDATED NATIONAL INTERVENORS, INC.,
Respondents

COMBINED APPENDIX TO BRIEFS IN OPPOSITION TO PETITIONS FOR WRITS OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

RICHARD E. AYRES
Attorney for Respondents
Mailing Address:
NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL, INC.
917 Fifteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

RICHARD COTTON
Attorney for Respondents
Mailing Address:
NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL, INC.
2345 Yale Street
Palo Alto, California 94306

BLEED THROUGH POOR COPY

APPENDIX

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Atomic Energy Commission, Dkt. No. RM-50-3, Environmental Effects of the Uranium Fuel Cycle, Transcript of Questioning by the Hearing Board Addressed to Dr. Frank K. Pittman, U.S. AEC Division of Waste Management and Transportation, Thursday, February 1, 1973 ..... A-1

Statutes Involved A-7

1. National Environmental Policy Act § 102, 42 U.S.C. § 4332 (1969) A-7

2. Administrative Procedure Act § 10(e), 5 U.S.C. § 706 (1970) A-10

BLEED THROUGH POOR COPY

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF: URANIUM FUEL CYCLE	Docket No. RM-50-3

New Executive Office Building
Room G2008
17th & H Streets
Washington, D.C.

Thursday, 1 February 1973

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing pursuant to notice, at 10 a.m.

BEFORE:

M. D. PAGLIN, ESQ., Chairman.
DR. JOHN C. GEYER, Member.
DR. M. J. STEINDLER, Member.

APPEARANCES:

(As heretofore noted.)

ADDITIONAL APPEARANCES:

ARVIN E. UPTON, ESQ. and JAMES P. MCGRANERY, JR., ESQ., Lebauf, [*sic*] Lamb, Leeby [*sic*] & MacRae, 1821 Jefferson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C., on behalf of Alabama Power Company, et al.

AFTERNOON SESSION

2:00 P.M.

CHAIRMAN PAGLIN: Will the proceeding come to order? The Board has determined and with the kind

cooperation of Mr. Roisman, in order to accommodate Dr. Pittman, we would like to put some Board questioning to Dr. Pittman at this stage and then we will recommence with Mr. Roisman's group.

So the Board Members have questions of Dr. Pittman at this time. Dr. Steindler?

DR. STEINDLER: There has been some discussion and you alluded to it in your testimony regarding our present ability, the present ability of the nuclear industry to retain high level wastes in a safe fashion. Is there anything that your studies have shown that indicates that at this point, as apparently practiced in the industry, the retention of high level wastes is a real problem?

DR. PITTMAN: There is nothing that I can see with regard to the commercial high level wastes, either from the point of view of what the industry will have to do under the regulatory scheme, or what the AEC will have to do, once the solidified waste is delivered to them, to us.

The possible retention for up to five years in stainless steel tanks, as an acid solution is the type of thing we have had at Idaho Falls for of the order of ten years, and the type of thing we have been doing in stainless steel tanks at Idaho Falls for ten years, retention in acid solutions with no problems at all.

The next step the industry has to carry out is if they decide to wait five years and retain it as acid solution, to solidify the material, there are several methods of solidification, the method that was chosen by the first company who is going into business this year is that of using the fluid bed calcination technique, which again is one that has been demonstrated at Idaho Falls for ten years, and they then put that into cannisters and store it in basins of water.

All of this is under the license control of the regulatory group. The basin storage is similar to the type of

BLEED THROUGH POOR COPY

storage that is used at reactors for storing spent fuel elements that have essentially the same fission product contents, they have a lot more, has more plutonium than uranium, so it has a problem of material that we don't have in the wastes.

The sealing by ten feet steel cannisters is certainly no breakthrough in technology, it is something that can be done and has been done in many industries for a long period of time. The transportation of the spent wastes in the casks of the same type that have been used to transport spent fuel in my opinion is a demonstrated technology.

And the engineered surface storage of these wastes once delivered to the Commission is purely an engineering application of technologies that have been known for many years and that have been used by the Commission in not waste storage, because in our previous systems we used other methods, but in my opinion there is no technology that needs to be developed in order for the whole storage of wastes from the time it is generated and it is kept in manageable sized containers, from that point on, to the time we get it and store it in the engineered storage in managably sized retrievable, monitorable, maintainable containers.

The engineered storage, you have heard the words, we have designed for one hundred years, that is purely meant to show that the basic basins, the facilities in which these materials will be received and stored, are built with the latest technology for concrete and steel, and will certainly last a hundred years, probably a lot longer with adequate maintenance of the facilities.

We do not necessarily expect a given cannister delivered to us in 1983 to not have some corrosion problems in one hundred years. They can quite easily be overcanned or recanned or maintained and we have techniques built into the engineered storage facility that will allow us to detect when there is a leak before it

becomes a major leak, and to identify which tank is leaking, to take it out and repair it or repackage it.

DR. STEINDLER: Then the picture that I think I am beginning to see here is that at the moment it appears that the high level wastes are retainable in the individual reprocessing facilities, and that the engineered storage area will consolidate the waste surveillance and handling problem into one site and that is really its major contribution, not the development of some new technology.

DR. PITTMAN: There is nothing new being developed in the engineered storage facility. We are looking at better techniques of removing the heat, more efficient techniques of removing the heat than maybe used before. But it is purely an engineering application of known technology we are using.

And the idea of bringing these together at one site under the auspices of one agency, namely the Atomic Energy Commission, has to do more with the assurance of continued control for whatever period of time is necessary.

DR. STEINDLER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAGLIN: Dr. Geyer?

DR. GEYER: Dr. Pittman, I refer to Table H-1 on page H-3 of the Survey Report.

DR. PITTMAN: Yes, sir.

DR. GEYER: There appears there numbers of shipments per model LWR annual fuel requirement. The question is will these remain constant with time over the years?

DR. PITTMAN: Per annual fuel requirement as it is now known, they will remain constant for the waste.

There are several factors which might make it fewer shipments, because we are assuming that the waste material in the can, has a very low density, and we can only get the equivalents of 3 tons of fuel reprocessed, the waste from three tons, into a can.

BLEED THROUGH POOR COPY

We have under development methods of solidification which might cut that down by a factor of 3 or more in the amount of wastes that you can get into a can. If it makes any sense. We feel that the packaging and shipping and storage of the low density material that is being produced by the first reprocessors going into business is perfectly safe, but there may be some economics in being able to get more of this material into a given can, which would cut down on the number of shipments, per year, per reactor.

DR. GEYER: I assume then that one could make an estimate of the number of model LWR's or the equivalents of them that would be present 30 years from now, and that would be the number of, multiplied by one, would be the number of shipments of high level wastes?

DR. PITTMAN: I don't have the figures in my head for the number of shipments we are assuming will have to take place per year from the economy and, the nuclear economy in the year 2000. I do remember a figure, I will be glad to submit a corrected figure for the record, but I do remember a figure that in the year 2000 there will be 8,000 cans delivered during that year, if I remember the figure correctly. In other words, the slope is going up very rapidly towards the end of the century.

DR. GEYER: But it would be desirable to have in the record some of the long term estimates, just to see what the scope of this problem may be in the future.

DR. PITTMAN: This would be for the entire economy?

DR. GEYER: That is right.

DR. PITTMAN: We have the figures. I can get them for the record.

DR. GEYER: It would be nice to have them for say 25 and 50 years, just to see what they might look like.

DR. PITTMAN: Yes, what we are assuming is this one facility we build will handle everything generated

through its end of the century. And then there would have to be more facilities, maybe expansion of this one, maybe new facilities or maybe other techniques would be used by that time.

DR. GEYER: My next question bears on the same problem in a sense. There will certainly be a considerable amount of this material in transit and since the cell storage under water of the high level waste is apparently being considered to be an interim measure, to be subsequently replaced by permanent resolution of the storage problem, why not leave the wastes where they are?

DR. PITTMAN: This is one of the things that is being given consideration, not so much from the standpoint of leaving them where they are in the basins of the reprocessor, but rather in the selection of sites.

One of the factors we are looking at in the selection of sites is does it make sense for us to have several government owned and operated repositories, right adjacent to or near the location of the reprocessing plants, so the initial shipment of this waste while it is at its hotest, namely after ten years, would be minimized?

DR. GEYER: Why not right on the site?

DR. PITTMAN: It is possible right on the site, under government control. We are still assuming government control is necessary. This is being looked at and evaluated against a single repository. The early indications seem to give the economics in favor of one single repository versus a series of small ones, but that is only economics.

DR. GEYER: Thank you, sir. That is all.

CHAIRMAN PAGLIN: Thank you very much, Dr. Pittman.

DR. PITTMAN: Thank you, sir.

BLEED THROUGH POOR COPY

National Environmental Policy Act § 102

5 U.S.C. § 4332

§ 4332. Cooperation of agencies; reports; availability of information; recommendations; international and national coordination of efforts

The Congress authorizes and directs that, to the fullest extent possible: (1) the policies, regulations, and public laws of the United States shall be interpreted and administered in accordance with the policies set forth in this chapter, and (2) all agencies of the Federal Government shall—

(A) utilize a systematic, interdisciplinary approach which will insure the integrated use of the natural and social sciences and the environmental design arts in planning and in decisionmaking which may have an impact on man's environment;

(B) identify and develop methods and procedures, in consultation with the Council on Environmental Quality established by subchapter II of this chapter, which will insure that presently unquantified environmental amenities and values may be given appropriate consideration in decisionmaking along with economic and technical considerations;

(C) include in every recommendation or report on proposals for legislation and other major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment, a detailed statement by the responsible official on—

(i) the environmental impact of the proposed action,

(ii) any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented,

(iii) alternatives to the proposed action,

(iv) the relationship between local short-term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity, and

(v) any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved in the proposed action should it be implemented.

Prior to making any detailed statement, the responsible Federal official shall consult with and obtain the comments of any Federal agency which has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved. Copies of such statement and the comments and views of the appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies, which are authorized to develop and enforce environmental standards, shall be made available to the President, the Council on Environmental Quality and to the public as provided by section 552 of Title 5, and shall accompany the proposal through the existing agency review processes;

(D) study, develop, and describe appropriate alternatives to recommended courses of action in any proposal which involves unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources;

(E) recognize the worldwide and long-range character of environmental problems and, where consistent with the foreign policy of the United States, lend appropriate support to initiatives, resolutions, and programs designed to maximize international cooperation in anticipating and preventing a decline in the quality of mankind's world environment;

(F) make available to States, counties, municipalities, institutions, and individuals, advice and in-

BLEED THROUGH POOR COPY

formation useful in restoring, maintaining, and enhancing the quality of the environment;

(G) initiate and utilize ecological information in the planning and development of resource-oriented projects; and

(H) assist the Council on Environmental Quality established by subchapter II of this chapter.

Administrative Procedure Act § 10(e)

5 U.S.C. § 706

§ 706. Scope of review

To the extent necessary to decision and when presented, the reviewing court shall decide all relevant questions of law, interpret constitutional and statutory provisions, and determine the meaning or applicability of the terms of an agency action. The reviewing court shall—

(1) compel agency action unlawfully withheld or unreasonably delayed; and

(2) hold unlawful and set aside agency action, findings, and conclusions found to be—

(A) arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law;

(B) contrary to constitutional right, power, privilege, or immunity;

(C) in excess of statutory jurisdiction, authority, or limitations, or short of statutory right;

(D) without observance of procedure required by law;

(E) unsupported by substantial evidence in a case subject to sections 556 and 557 of this title or otherwise reviewed on the record of an agency hearing provided by statute; or

(F) unwarranted by the facts to the extent that the facts are subject to trial de novo by the reviewing court.

In making the foregoing determinations, the court shall review the whole record or those parts of it cited by a party, and due account shall be taken of the rule of prejudicial error.

BLEED THROUGH POOR COPY